



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/040,977	12/31/2001	Kristine B. Fuimaono	36773/KMO/W112	1747
23363	7590	06/28/2004	EXAMINER	
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP			MANUEL, GEORGE C	
PO BOX 7068			ART UNIT	
PASADENA, CA 91109-7068			PAPER NUMBER	

3762
DATE MAILED: 06/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/040,977

Applicant(s)

FUIMAONO ET AL.

Examiner

George Manuel

Art Unit

3762

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 43 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23, 28, 30 and 36-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 24-27, 29, 31-35, 39-42 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/23/04
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 2-4, 14-17, 20, 21 and 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims are indefinite because a broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). For example, in the present

Art Unit: 3762

instance, because of the word "about", claim 2 recites the broad recitation "less than 10mm to more than 100mm", and the claim also recites "more than 10mm to less than 100mm" which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation. This same use of the word "about" causes claims 3, 4, 14-17, 20, 21 and 36-38 to be indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Claims 1, 5, 7, 9, 10, 18-21 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Dahl et al '779.

Dahl discloses and electrode assembly 14 comprising a plurality of spines 24 and a tip electrode 20.

Claims 1-3, 5, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Edhag '894.

Edhag discloses and electrode assembly 12 comprising a plurality of spines 13 where each electrode is at least about 20-30 millimeters.

Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 18, 22 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by McGee et al '592.

McGee et al discloses and electrode assembly 90 comprising a plurality of spines 94 and ring electrodes 92. See Fig. 10.

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Ljungstroem '864.

Ljungstroem discloses and electrode assembly 2 comprising a plurality of spines 15 and a patch electrode 3.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4, 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edhag '894.

Regarding claim 4, Edhag teaches each electrode is at least 20-30 millimeters; therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to lengthen the electrodes to about 50 mm.

Regarding claims 13 and 14, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to provide a catheter length of about 120 cm because this is a length needed to reach the inside of the heart from outside of the body via a major vein to the heart.

Regarding claims 15-17, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to use 3 joules to defibrillate the heart because a relatively low amount of electrical stimulation is required to directly stimulate the heart.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 43 is allowed.

Claims 24-27, 29, 31-35, 39-42 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion


The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Imran '381 discloses a related defibrillation electrode for use within the heart.

Application/Control Number: 10/040,977

Page 6

Art Unit: 3762

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George Manuel whose telephone number is (703) 308-2118.


George Manuel
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 3762

6/7/04